

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-38 were pending and rejected. In this response, claims 1-31 have been canceled without prejudice. No claim has been amended. In addition, new claim 39 has been added. Thus, claims 32-39 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-2 have been objected for informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-10, 12-30, and 32-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,850,352 to Moezzi, ("Moezzi"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 32-39 include limitations that are not disclosed by Moezzi.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 32 recites as follows:

32. Apparatus for tracking selected objects in a scene comprising:
one or more cameras arranged to obtain one or more real scene images;
image processing means for identifying said selected objects in said one or more real scene images;
means for providing an estimate of the position of said one or more selected objects based on their position in the one or more real scene images;
a user interface adapted to allow an operator to view said estimate of the position of selected objects in a real scene image, said user interface including input means to allow an operator to modify said estimate.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 32 is related to an apparatus for tracking selected objects in a scene

including a user interface to allow a user to both view the estimated position of the selected objects and modify the estimated position. It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is absent from Moezzi.

Although Moezzi discloses a user interface to view certain selected objects; however, such a user interface does not allow a user to modify the estimated position of the selected objects. The Office Action contended that section of col. 20, lines 30-24 of Moezzi discloses such a limitation (see 2/6/2007 Office Action, pp. 9-10). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, the cited section of Moezzi states:

"A viewer interface is responsive to a viewer of the scene to receive a viewer selection of a desired view on the scene. This selected and desired view need not be identical to any views that are within any of the multiple received video images."

(see Moezzi, col. 20, lines 30-34, emphasis added)

Thus, the viewer interface of Moezzi only allows a viewer to view certain views from the scene. This is consistent with Moezzi's disclosure in which the viewer interface is for use by a viewer and is confined to selecting a desired view. It is respectfully submitted that Moezzi fails to disclose a user interface which allows an operator not only to view but also to modify an estimated position of an object.

In contrast, the present invention as claimed includes a user interface that not only allows a user to view, but also allows the user to modify an estimated position of an object.

In order to anticipate a claim, each and every limitations of the key must be taught by the cited reference. In view of the foregoing discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Moezzi fails to disclose each and every limitations of claim 32. Therefore, independent claim 32 is not anticipated by Moezzi.

Similarly, independent claim 39 includes limitations similar to those recited in claim 32. Thus, for reasons similar to those with respect to claim 32, it is respectfully submitted that

claim 39 is not anticipated by Moezzi. Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Moezzi.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action has rejected claims 31 and 36-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moezzi as applied to claims 30 and 32 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,933 to Sharir, et al., ("Sharir"). Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moezzi as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,579 to MacInnis ("MacInnis").

Claim 31 has been cancelled and claims 36-38 depend from claim 32. Thus, in view of the foregoing discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Sharir and MacInnis, individually or in combination, also fail to disclose the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 32-39 are patentable over Moezzi, Sharir, and MacInnis. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: May 3, 2007


Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095
Kevin_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300